DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SHOOK, HARDY&BACON LLP

GENEVA KANSAS CITY LONDON MIAMI

HAMILTON SQUARE 600 14TH STREET, NW, SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-2004 TELEPHONE (202) 783-8400 F FACSIMILE (202) 783-4211

OVERLAND PARK SAN FRANCISCO TAMPA

January 14, 2002

Rodney L. Joyce 202-639-5602 rjoyce@shb.com

RECEIVED

REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

JAN 1 4 2002

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Fifth Floor Washington, D.C. 20554

PEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re:

CC Docket No. 01-347

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed for filing are (a) one original of the unredacted Opposition of Network Access Solutions ("Opposition") and (b) one original and two copies of the redacted Opposition.

Rodney L. Joyce

Counsel for Network Access Solutions Corp.

Attachment

No. of Copies rec'd C List ABCDE

REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, DC 20554 RECEIVED

JAN 1 4 2002

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of:

Application by Verizon New Jersey Inc.)	
for Authorization to Provide In-Region,)	CC Docket No. 01-347
InterLATA Services in the State of New Jersey)	

OPPOSITION OF NETWORK ACCESS SOLUTIONS CORPORATION

Network Access Solutions Corporation (NAS), pursuant to the Public Notice issued December 20, 2001 in the above-referenced docket, hereby files its opposition to the application filed on December 20, 2001 by Verizon New Jersey, and its subsidiaries, for authority to provide in-region, inter-LATA services in the State of New Jersey.

According to Section 271 (c)(2)(B)(II) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act), Verizon New Jersey is required to provide nondiscriminatory access to network elements. As the information provided below clearly demonstrates, Verizon continues to discriminate in favor of its own customers in several significant areas.

For example, information reported by Verizon to NAS in its November 2001

Carrier-to-Carrier Report for New Jersey demonstrates that Verizon missed __% more appointments for NAS customers than Verizon missed for its own customers. Similarly, the standard interval for Verizon dispatch is __% worse for NAS customers than for Verizon's own customers.

		Actual Performance		Number of Observations		Discriminatory Variance
		VZ	NAS Aggregate	VZ	NAS Aggregate	
	PR-4 - Missed Appointments					
PR-4-03-3341	% MA – Customer	-	-	-	-	-
PR-4-10-3341	% MA – VZ – Std. Interval (W Coded) Orders – Dispatch	_	_	_	-	_
	PR-6 - Installation Quality					
PR-6-01-3341	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days	_				
111-0-01-3341	% Inst. Troubles	-		-		

Also, as the following data demonstrates (also taken from the November Carrier-to Carrier Report for New Jersey), Verizon continues to provide more favorable maintenance (i.e., mean time to repair) to its own customers. For example, in November, according to Verizon's own numbers, the "Network Trouble Report Rate" for NAS was

__% worse than for its own customers. Additionally, Verizon's "Total Mean Time to Repair" was __% worse for NAS customers than for Verizon customers, the "Percent Out-of -Service for more than 12 hours" was __% higher for NAS customers than for Verizon's own customers, and NAS' "Repeat Reports within 30 days" exceeded Verizon's own customers by more than __%.

		Actual Performance		Number of Observations		Discriminatory Variance
		VZ	NAS Aggregate	VZ	NAS Aggregate	
	MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate					
MR-2-02-3341	Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop		-	-		-
MR-2-03-3341	Network Trouble Report Rate – Central Office	-	_	_	_	-
MR-2-05-3341	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	-	_	-		-
	MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals					
MR-4-01-3341		-	-	_	-	_
MR-4-02-3341			-	_	-	-
MR-4-07-3341	% Out of Service > 12 hours					
	MR-5 - Repeat					
MR-5-01-3341	Trouble Reports % Repeat Reports within 30 Days		-			-
	Complex Services - 2 Wire xDSL Loops					
	MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate					
MR-2-02-3342	Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop	-	-	-		-
	MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals					
MR-4-07-3342	% Out of Service > 12 hours	_		<u>-</u>	-	

Verizon's continued preference for its own customers in both provisioning and

maintenance of circuits is contrary to both the intent and the requirements of Section 271

of the Act. Congress correctly recognized that without nondiscriminatory provisioning and maintenance, competitors cannot effectively compete against the monopoly incumbent. Verizon's own data demonstrates that Verizon has not complied with Section 271 (c)(2)(B)(II) in the State of New Jersey. Verizon's Application for authority to provide in-region, interLATA services in the State of New Jersey should be denied.

Respectfully Submitted

NETWORK ACCESS SOLUTIONS CORP.

By: Don Sussman

Vice President

Regulatory Affairs/Vendor Relations Network Access Solutions Corporation

13650 Dulles Technology Drive

Herndon, VA 20171

703-793-5102

January 14, 2002

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 14th day of January, 2002, I mailed, true and correct copies of the redacted and unredacted Opposition of Network Access Solutions to:

Evan T. Leo Kellog, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans,

PLLC

Sumner Square

1615 M Street, N.W.

Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036

James G. Pachulski TechNet Law Group, P.C. 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 365

Washington, D.C. 20005

Mike Glover Verizon 1320 North Courthouse Road 8th Floor Arlington, VA 22201

Janice Myles Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 5-B145 Washington, D.C. 20554 (12 copies) John S. Lynch
US Dept. of Justice
Antitrust Division
Telecommunications Task Force
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 8000

Washington, D.C. 20005 (by hand)

Bruce D. Cohen Verizon New Jersey Inc. 540 Broad Street Second Floor Newark, NJ

Anthony Centrella, Director Division of Telecommunications New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Two Gateway Center, 8th Floor Newark, NY 07102

Qualex International Portals II 445 12th Street, S.W., Room CY-B402 Washington, D.C. 20554

Rodney L. Joyce